

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 9-17, 20-28, 31-39, and 42-44 are pending in the present application with claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 being the independent claims. Claims 46-60 are hereby canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 12, 16, 17, 22, 23, 27, 28, 33, 34, 38, 39, and 44 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

In the office action dated July 7, 2010, claims 1-6, 9-17, 20-28, 31-39, and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims consistent with the following remarks.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Examiner McDowell for conducting an interview with applicants' undersigned representative on August 24, 2010. Applicants' representative and the examiner discussed the subject matter of the claims, proposed claim amendments, and the cited art. Applicants set forth below a summary of the arguments presented in the interview.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C §103

In the final rejection, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 12, 13, 15-17, 20, 23, 24, 26-28, 31, 34, 35, 37-39, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0021278 filed by Hinckley *et al.* (hereinafter "Hinckley") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0198029 filed by Tenhunen *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as "Tenhunen"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites "configuring a first logical button from among said logical buttons to *execute*, upon activation of the first logical button, *a first command call and a second command call at the computing device when the computing device is in a first orientation*" and "responsive to the detection of the change in orientation the image, automatically logically remapping the commands to the logical buttons based on the second orientation of the images presented on the display by configuring a second logical button from among said logical buttons to *execute*, upon activation of the second logical button, *the first command call and the second*

command call when the computing device is in the second orientation.” Applicants respectfully assert that the cited references fails to disclose or suggest these elements.

In the Response to Arguments section of the office action, the examiner asserts that Tenhunan discloses configuring a first logical button to execute one of a first command call and a second command call and remapping the commands to the logical buttons based on a second orientation of the images presented on the display by configuring a second logical button from among said logical buttons to execute one of the first command call and the second command call. The examiner cites Figures la-b and paragraph [0019] of Tenhunan. This section asserts that the first logical button '1' shown in Figure 1a is configured upon activation to execute one of a first command call (dial '1') and a second command call (dial '#'), and when Tenhunan's display is turned upside down, the commands to the second logical button '#' are remapped to execute one of a first command call (dial '1') and a second command call (dial '#') based on the second orientation of the images presented on the display, as shown in Figure 1b.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the assertion that Tenhunan's logical buttons are remapped based on the orientation of the images presented on the display. As stated in Tenhunan at paragraph [0020], Tenhunan uses a state sensor “which is arranged to *sense the normal operating position of the mobile station* and the corresponding essentially upsidedown operating position.” Thus Tenhunan does not remap logical buttons based on “the detection of *the change in orientation relative to the display of the images presented on the display*” as claimed in claim 1, but instead detects a change in orientation of the device itself.

Moreover, while Tenhunan's logical buttons may be configured to execute one of two command calls, such buttons are only configured to execute one command call in any particular orientation. For example, as shown in the cited figures Tenhunan, and as noted in the office action, when Tenhunan's device is in a normal orientation, the logical '1' button is configured only to execute a “dial 1” command call, and is not configured to execute a “dial #” command call. When the device is in an upside down orientation, the logical '1' button is configured only to execute a “dial #” command call, and is not configured to execute a “dial 1” command call. In contradistinction, claim 1 discloses configuring a logical button to execute a first command call **and** a second command call when the computing device is in a first orientation.

Claim 1 also recites “detecting *a change in orientation, relative to the display, of an images as displayed on the display* from the first orientation to a second orientation at the computing device.” The office action asserts that Hinckley Figures 10 and 11 and paragraphs [0072] and [0073] disclose this element. Applicants respectfully disagree. These sections of Hinckley state that a “*tilt sensor* is used to detect the orientation of the mobile device so that the image on the display of the mobile device may be matched to the mobile device orientation”, and “rotation is sensed by the *tilt sensors* and in response, a new image 1104 of the set of text is displayed.” Hinckley’s tilt sensors sense only “the angle of its physical attitude with respect to gravity.” *Hinckley paragraph [0036]*. Thus, in Hinckley tilt sensors are used to determine a physical position of a device relative to gravity. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Hinckley of detecting a change in orientation, relative to the display, of an image presented on the display. As noted above, Tenhunan fails to cure this deficiency of Hinckley.

Because neither Tenhunan nor Hinckley disclose or suggest configuring a first logical button to execute one of a first command call and a second command call and remapping logical buttons by configuring a second logical button one of the first command call and the second command call, Tenhunan and Hinckley, taken individually or together, cannot be said to disclose or suggest the subject matter of claim 1. For similar reasons, Tenhunan and Hinckley cannot be said to disclose or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 12, 23, and 34. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants acknowledge that the final rejection asserts additional grounds for rejection of the claims that are dependent upon claims 1, 12, 23, and 34. However, in view of the traversals set forth with respect to the independent claims, applicants believe that all such dependent claims are in condition for allowance by virtue of their dependence upon independent claim 1, 12, 23, and 34, rendering the rejections of those claims moot. Moreover, applicants submit that the remaining claims recite features that provide a separate basis for patentability. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of all claims that depend from independent claims 1, 12, 23, and 34. Applicants reserve the right to challenge the rejection of any of those dependent claims in any future response that may be forthcoming.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-3471/304033.02
Application No.: 10/769,691
Office Action Dated: July 7, 2010

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that this application, including claims 1-6, 9-17, 20-28, 31-39, and 42-44, is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 4, 2011

/Aaron F. Bourgeois/
Aaron F. Bourgeois
Registration No. 57,936

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439